



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/814,907	03/26/2004	Reinhold Kautzleben	6570P027	6322

8791 7590 11/13/2008
BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP
1279 OAKMEAD PARKWAY
SUNNYVALE, CA 94085-4040

EXAMINER

LINDSEY, MATTHEW S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2451

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

11/13/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/814,907	Applicant(s) KAUTZLEBEN ET AL.	
	Examiner MATTHEW S. LINDSEY	Art Unit 2451	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 September 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-32 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-32 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-32 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 13, 24 and 29 have been amended as filed on 2 September 2008.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

2. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 2 September 2008 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2451

4. Claims 1-7, 13-17, 24-28, and 29-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Viswanath (US 2004/0019662) in view of Kekic et al. (US 6,664,978 B1).

5. With respect to Claim 1, Viswanath disclosed: “A monitoring system employed within a network ([0024], lines 1-5) comprising:

a file including semantics and directives to generate a monitor tree ([0025], lines 12-18) for a monitoring system compatible with Java management extensions (JMX) ([0120], lines 1-3), wherein the file is retrieved from a database ([0065], lines 9-12, specifically “database-based”) by a monitor service ([0025], lines 1-5, in order to use the meta-information, the administration framework generator mechanism must retrieve the meta information); where the semantics and directives define a hierarchical architecture ([0063], second col., lines 1-8) of a plurality of resources of a cluster of application servers ([0046], lines 1-3 and [0053], lines 1-3) spanning multiple Java virtual machines (JVMs) ([0030], lines 1-5), the semantics defining information about the monitor tree, monitor managed beans, and resources to be monitored ([0025], lines 1-6 and 12-18), and the directives defining how the semantics are to be implemented to form the monitor tree ([0025], lines 1-6 and 12-18), wherein the cluster of application servers includes multiple application server instances ([0057], lines 13-16) and a central services instance that provides communication and synchronization among the multiple application server instances ([0030], lines 5-8, and [0154], lines 7-13, where the central

Art Unit: 2451

services instance is an administration server which provides communication and synchronization among the application servers);

the monitor tree generated based, at least in part, on the semantics and the directives of the file ([0025], lines 1-6) to monitor the plurality of resources ([0128], lines 1-4 and Abstract, lines 5-7), wherein the monitor tree includes a hierarchical grouping of a plurality of nodes ([0025], lines 1-6 and 14-18, where elements have hierarchical relationships), each of the plurality of nodes having a monitor managed bean and a resource of the plurality of resources associated with the monitor managed bean ([0024], lines 8-14 and [0021], lines 1-2) and a runtime bean associated with the resource that interfaces the resource with the monitor managed bean ([0127], lines 9-16 and Fig. 6)” and

“a visual administrator module to provide a graphical user interface to the monitoring system ([0087], lines 1-4, and [0153], lines 7-9, where an error message is displayed on the administration user interface, therefore the administration UI must graphical in order to display a message to a user)”,

Viswanath did not explicitly state: “wherein each node provides an individual report of the resources associated with the monitor managed bean of the node, where the monitor tree enables distributed monitoring of the resources without requiring all monitoring data to be reported to a central location” or “the visual administrator providing access to monitoring information of each resource without requiring all monitoring data to be reported to a central location”.

However, Kekic disclosed: “wherein each node provides an individual report of the resources associated with the monitor managed bean of the node (Col. 2, lines 33-38), where the monitor tree enables distributed monitoring of the resources (Col. 2, lines 63-67) without requiring all monitoring data to be reported to a central location (Col. 2, lines 33-41, agent processes monitor and control the operation of the network element by maintaining a MIB)”, and “the visual administrator providing access to monitoring information of each resource (Col. 2, lines 39-41) without requiring all monitoring data to be reported to a central location (Col. 2, lines 33-35, agent processes monitor and control the operation of the network element by maintaining a MIB)”.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the server administration system of Viswanath with the teachings of Kekic to include support for each node to provide an individual report of its resources without requiring all monitoring data to be reported to a central location. Motivation to combine these references comes from Kekic where: “SNMP is an industry standard for managing heterogeneous TCP/IP-based computer network elements from a single management application” (Col. 1, lines 63-65). SNMP includes agents, as described by Kekic Col. 2, lines 33-41, which maintain a database reflecting the status of the network element. Therefore by combining the references, the server administration system of Viswanath can use industry standards for managing heterogeneous TCP/IP-based computer networks.

Art Unit: 2451

6. With respect to Claim 13, Viswanath disclosed: “A computer-implemented method employed within a network ([0024], lines 1-5) comprising:

accessing a file in a database ([0065], lines 9-12, specifically “database-based”, and [0025], lines 1-5, in order to use the meta-information, the administration framework generator mechanism must access the meta information), the file having semantics and directives to generate a monitor tree ([0025], lines 12-18) for a monitoring system compatible with Java management extensions (JMX) ([0120], lines 1-3) to individually monitor a plurality of resources within the network ([0128], lines 1-4 and Abstract, lines 5-7) where the semantics and directives define a hierarchical architecture ([0063], second col., lines 1-8) of the plurality of resources of a cluster of application servers ([0046], lines 1-3 and [0053], lines 1-3) spanning multiple Java virtual machines (JVMs) ([0030], lines 1-5), the semantics defining information about the monitor tree, monitor managed beans, and resources to be monitored ([0025], lines 1-6 and 12-18), and the directives defining how the semantics are to be implemented to form the monitor tree ([0025], lines 1-6 and 12-18), wherein the cluster of application servers includes multiple application server instances ([0057], lines 13-16) and a central services instance that provides communication and synchronization among the multiple application server instances ([0030], lines 5-8, and [0154], lines 7-13, where the central services instance is an administration server which provides communication and synchronization among the application servers);

generating the monitor tree based, at least in part, on the semantics and the directives of the file ([0025], lines 1-6), the monitor tree to monitor the plurality of

Art Unit: 2451

resources ([0025], lines 14-18, where an hierarchical relationship implies a plurality of nodes), wherein the monitor tree includes a hierarchical grouping of a plurality of nodes ([0025], lines 1-6 and 14-18, where elements have hierarchical relationships), each of the plurality of nodes having a monitor managed bean and a resource of the plurality of resources associated with the monitor managed bean ([0024], lines 8-14 and [0021], lines 1-2) and a runtime bean associated with the resource that interfaces the resource with the monitor managed bean ([0127], lines 9-16 and Fig. 6)” and

“each of the plurality of nodes having a monitor managed bean and a resource of the plurality of resources associated with the monitor managed bean ([0024], lines 8-14)”.

Viswanath did not explicitly state: “wherein each node provides an individual report of the resources associated with the monitor managed bean of the node, where the monitor tree enables distributed monitoring of the resources without requiring all monitoring data to be reported to a central location”, or “and displaying, at least a portion of, the generated monitor tree on a graphical user interface of a visual administrator, wherein the displayed portion of the generated monitor tree includes the plurality of nodes”, or “including providing access through the graphical user interface to monitoring information of each resource without requiring all monitoring data to be reported to a central location”.

However, Kekic disclosed: “wherein each node provides an individual report of the resources associated with the monitor managed bean of the node (Col. 2, lines 33-

Art Unit: 2451

38), where the monitor tree enables distributed monitoring of the resources (Col. 2, lines 63-67) without requiring all monitoring data to be reported to a central location (Col. 2, lines 33-41, agent processes monitor and control the operation of the network element by maintaining a MIB)",

"and displaying, at least a portion of, the generated monitor tree on a graphical user interface of a visual administrator, wherein the displayed portion of the generated monitor tree includes the plurality of nodes (Col. 5, lines 47-51 and Figure 3B, object 305)", and

"including providing access through the graphical user interface to monitoring information of each resource (Col. 2, lines 39-41, where the SNMP manager can make requests for monitored information, and Col. 5, lines 40-44, where a network element is presented to a user through GUI, so the user can see a visual representation of the components of the computer network element) without requiring all monitoring data to be reported to a central location (Col. 2, lines 33-35, agent processes monitor and control the operation of the network element by maintaining a MIB)".

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the server administration system of Viswanath with the teachings of Kekic to include support for each node to provide an individual report of its resources without requiring all monitoring data to be reported to a central location. Motivation to combine these references comes from Kekic where: "SNMP is an industry standard for managing heterogeneous TCP/IP-based computer network elements from a single management application" (Col. 1, lines 63-65). SNMP includes agents, as described by

Art Unit: 2451

Kekic Col. 2, lines 33-41, which maintain a database reflecting the status of the network element. Therefore by combining the references, the server administration system of Viswanath can use industry standards for managing heterogeneous TCP/IP-based computer networks.

7. With respect to Claim 24, Viswanath disclosed: “A system (Abstract, line 1) comprising:

a means for accessing a file in a database ([0065], lines 9-12, specifically “database-based”, and [0025], lines 1-5, in order to use the meta-information, the administration framework generator mechanism must access the meta information), the file having semantics and directives to generate a monitor tree ([0025], lines 12-18) for a monitoring system compatible with Java management extensions (JMX) ([0120], lines 1-3) to individually monitor a plurality of resources within the network ([0128], lines 1-4 and Abstract, lines 5-7), where the semantics and directives define a hierarchical architecture ([0063], second col., lines 1-8) of a plurality of resources of a cluster of application servers ([0046], lines 1-3 and [0053], lines 1-3) spanning multiple Java virtual machines (JVMs) ([0030], lines 1-5), the semantics defining information about the monitor tree, monitor managed beans, and resources to be monitored ([0025], lines 1-6 and 12-18), and the directives defining how the semantics are to be implemented to form the monitor tree ([0025], lines 1-6 and 12-18), wherein the cluster of application servers includes multiple application server instances ([0057], lines 13-16) and a central services instance that provides communication and synchronization among the multiple

Art Unit: 2451

application server instances ([0030], lines 5-8, and [0154], lines 7-13, where the central services instance is an administration server which provides communication and synchronization among the application servers);

a means for generating the monitor tree based, at least in part, on the semantics and the directives of the file ([0025], lines 1-6), the monitor tree to monitor the plurality of resources ([0025], lines 14-18, where an hierarchical relationship implies a plurality of nodes), wherein the monitor tree includes a hierarchical grouping of a plurality of nodes ([0025], lines 1-6 and 14-18, where elements have hierarchical relationships), each of the plurality of nodes having a monitor managed bean and a resource of the plurality of resources associated with the monitor managed bean ([0024], lines 8-14 and [0021], lines 1-2) and a runtime bean associated with the resource that interfaces the resource with the monitor managed bean ([0127], lines 9-16 and Fig. 6)” and

“each of the plurality of nodes having a monitor managed bean and a resource of the plurality of resources associated with the monitor managed bean ([0024], lines 8-14)”.

Viswanath did not explicitly state: “wherein each node provides an individual report of the resources associated with the monitor managed bean of the node, where the monitor tree enables distributed monitoring of the resources without requiring all monitoring data to be reported to a central location”, or “and a means for displaying, at least a portion of the generated monitor tree on a graphical user interface of a visual administrator, wherein the displayed portion of the generated monitor tree includes a plurality of nodes”, or “including providing access through the graphical user interface to

Art Unit: 2451

monitoring information of each resource without requiring all monitoring data to be reported to a central location”.

However, Kekic disclosed: “wherein each node provides an individual report of the resources associated with the monitor managed bean of the node (Col. 2, lines 33-38), where the monitor tree enables distributed monitoring of the resources (Col. 2, lines 63-67) without requiring all monitoring data to be reported to a central location (Col. 2, lines 33-41, agent processes monitor and control the operation of the network element by maintaining a MIB)”,

“and a means for displaying, at least a portion of, the generated monitor tree on a graphical user interface of a visual administrator, wherein the displayed portion of the generated monitor tree includes the plurality of nodes (Col. 5, lines 47-51 and Figure 3B, object 305)”, and

“including providing access through the graphical user interface to monitoring information of each resource (Col. 2, lines 39-41, where the SNMP manager can make requests for monitored information, and Col. 5, lines 40-44, where a network element is presented to a user through GUI, so the user can see a visual representation of the components of the computer network element) without requiring all monitoring data to be reported to a central location (Col. 2, lines 33-35, agent processes monitor and control the operation of the network element by maintaining a MIB)”.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the server administration system of Viswanath with the teachings of

Art Unit: 2451

Kekic to include support for each node to provide an individual report of its resources without requiring all monitoring data to be reported to a central location. Motivation to combine these references comes from Kekic where: "SNMP is an industry standard for managing heterogeneous TCP/IP-based computer network elements from a single management application" (Col. 1, lines 63-65). SNMP includes agents, as described by Kekic Col. 2, lines 33-41, which maintain a database reflecting the status of the network element. Therefore by combining the references, the server administration system of Viswanath can use industry standards for managing heterogeneous TCP/IP-based computer networks.

8. With respect to Claim 29, Viswanath disclosed: "An article of manufacture (Abstract, line 1) comprising: an electronically accessible medium providing instructions that, when executed by an apparatus, cause the apparatus to

access a file in a database ([0065], lines 9-12, specifically "database-based", and [0025], lines 1-5, in order to use the meta-information, the administration framework generator mechanism must access the meta information), the file having semantics and directives to generate a monitor tree ([0025], lines 12-18) for a monitoring system compatible with Java management extensions (JMX) ([0120], lines 1-3) to individually monitor a plurality of resources within the network ([0128], lines 1-4 and Abstract, lines 5-7), where the semantics and directives define a hierarchical architecture ([0063], second col., lines 1-8) of a plurality of resources of a cluster of application servers ([0046], lines 1-3 and [0053], lines 1-3) ;

Art Unit: 2451

generate the monitor tree based, at least in part, on the semantics and the directives of the file ([0025], lines 1-6), the monitor tree to monitor the plurality of resources ([0025], lines 14-18, where an hierarchical relationship implies a plurality of nodes), wherein the monitor tree includes a hierarchical grouping of a plurality of nodes ([0025], lines 1-6 and 14-18, where elements have hierarchical relationships), each of the plurality of nodes having a monitor managed bean and a resource of the plurality of resources associated with the monitor managed bean ([0024], lines 8-14 and [0021], lines 1-2) and a runtime bean associated with the resource that interfaces the resource with the monitor managed bean ([0127], lines 9-16 and Fig. 6)” and

“each of the plurality of nodes having a monitor managed bean and a resource of the plurality of resources associated with the monitor managed bean ([0024], lines 8-14)”.

Viswanath did not explicitly state: “wherein each node provides an individual report of the resources associated with the monitor managed bean of the node, where the monitor tree enables distributed monitoring of the resources without requiring all monitoring data to be reported to a central location”, or “and displaying, at least a portion of, the generated monitor tree on a graphical user interface of a visual administrator, wherein the displayed portion of the generated monitor tree includes the plurality of nodes”, or “including providing access through the graphical user interface to monitoring information of each resource without requiring all monitoring data to be reported to a central location”.

However, Kekic disclosed: “wherein each node provides an individual report of the resources associated with the monitor managed bean of the node (Col. 2, lines 33-38), where the monitor tree enables distributed monitoring of the resources (Col. 2, lines 63-67) without requiring all monitoring data to be reported to a central location (Col. 2, lines 33-41, agent processes monitor and control the operation of the network element by maintaining a MIB)”,

“and display, at least a portion of, the generated monitor tree on a graphical user interface of a visual administrator, wherein the displayed portion of the generated monitor tree includes the plurality of nodes (Col. 5, lines 47-51 and Figure 3B, object 305)”, and

“including providing access through the graphical user interface to monitoring information of each resource (Col. 2, lines 39-41, where the SNMP manager can make requests for monitored information, and Col. 5, lines 40-44, where a network element is presented to a user through GUI, so the user can see a visual representation of the components of the computer network element) without requiring all monitoring data to be reported to a central location (Col. 2, lines 33-35, agent processes monitor and control the operation of the network element by maintaining a MIB)”.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the server administration system of Viswanath with the teachings of Kekic to include support for each node to provide an individual report of its resources without requiring all monitoring data to be reported to a central location. Motivation to combine these references comes from Kekic where: “SNMP is an industry standard for managing

Art Unit: 2451

heterogeneous TCP/IP-based computer network elements from a single management application” (Col. 1, lines 63-65). SNMP includes agents, as described by Kekic Col. 2, lines 33-41, which maintain a database reflecting the status of the network element. Therefore by combining the references, the server administration system of Viswanath can use industry standards for managing heterogeneous TCP/IP-based computer networks.

9. With respect to Claim 2, the combination of Viswanath and Kekic disclose: “The system of claim 1, wherein the monitoring system is a Java management extensions (JMX) - based monitoring system (Viswanath, [0120], lines 1-3)”.

10. With respect to Claim 3, the combination of Viswanath and Kekic disclose: “The system of claim 2, wherein the visual administrator module comprises: a convenience interface to obtain information from the monitor service (Viswanath, [0046], lines 15-19); and a graphical user interface to provide a graphical representation of the monitor tree based, at least in part, on the information obtained by the convenience interface (Kekic, Col. 5, lines 40-51)”.

11. With respect to Claims 4, 14, 25, and 30 the combination of Viswanath and Kekic disclosed: “wherein the graphical user interface is to provide a window pane to display, at least a portion of, the graphical representation of the monitor tree (Kekic, Col. 5, lines 47-51 and Figure 3B, object 305)”.

12. With respect to Claims 15, 26, and 31 the combination of Viswanath and Kekic disclosed: “further comprising: selecting one of the plurality of nodes (Kekic, Col. 24, lines 22-27) the selected node having a monitor managed bean and a resource of the plurality of resources associated with the monitor managed bean (Viswanath, [0021], lines 1-7)”.

13. With respect to Claims 5, 16, and 27 the combination of Viswanath and Kekic disclosed: “wherein the graphical user interface is to further provide a second window pane to display a list of one or more properties for at least one of the plurality of nodes of the monitor tree (Kekic, Col. 23, lines 45-48 and Figures 6A and 6B, Object 603)”.

14. With respect to Claims 6, 17, and 28 the combination of Viswanath and Kekic disclosed: “wherein the list of one or more properties includes one or more key-value pairs, each key-value pair having a key to identify a listed property and a corresponding value to specify a current value of the identified property (Kekic, Figure 3B, under the heading “Status of “a_hotspot””, “Attribute Name” heading and “Value” heading)”.

15. With respect to Claim 7, the combination of Viswanath and Kekic disclosed: “The system of claim 4, wherein the graphical user interface is to select one of the plurality of nodes of the graphical representation of the monitor tree (Kekic, Col. 23, lines 43-48) the selected node having a monitor managed bean (Viswanath [0119], lines 1-7)”.

16. Claims 8-12, 18-23, and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Viswanath in view of Kekic as applied to claims 7, 15, and 30 above, and further in view of Fuchs (US 2003/0177477 A1).

17. With respect to Claims 8 and 18, the combination of Viswanath and Kekic disclose: “wherein the graphical user interface is to further provide a second window pane having an attribute tab (Kekic, Figure 3B, under the heading “Status of “a_hotspot””, and Col. 24, lines 12-13)”.

The combination of Viswanath and Kekic do not disclose: “and an operation tab”.

However, Fuchs disclosed: “and an operation tab ([0093] to [0095], specifically [0095], where each MBean management interface comprises operations)”.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the server administration system of Viswanath in view of Kekic with the teachings of Fuchs to include support for a interface having an operations tab. Motivation to combine these references comes from Kekic, “As a user looks at the visual display in the graphic user interface, the user is provided the same visual information as if the user where physically present at the location of the managed computer network element. Thus, at a glance, a user can obtain considerable information about the status of the computer network element as represented by the visual display (Abstract, lines 26-32)”. Therefore by combining the server administration

Art Unit: 2451

system of Viswanath in view of Kekic with the operations interface of Fuchs, a user can obtain operations information about a managed element at a glance.

18. With respect to Claims 9 and 19, the Claim is rejected for the same reasons as Claims 8 and 18 above.

In addition, Kekic disclosed: “wherein the second window pane is to display a list of one or more attributes of the monitor managed bean, if the attribute tab is selected (Kekic, Figure 3B, under the heading “Status of “a_hotspot””, and Col. 24, lines 12-13)”.

19. With respect to Claims 10 and 20, the Claim is rejected for the same reasons as Claims 8 and 18 above.

In addition, Kekic disclosed: “wherein at least one of the listed attributes includes a value field specifying a current value of the listed attribute (Col. 24, lines 12-13, and Figure 3B, under the heading “Status of “a_hotspot””, the Table column of Value)”.

20. With respect to Claim 21, the Claim is rejected for the same reasons as Claim 18 above.

In addition, the combination of Viswanath and Kekic disclosed: “The method of claim 20, further comprising: “entering a value (Viswanath, [0124], lines 15-19) listed in the value field (Kekic, Col. 24, lines 12-13 and lines 18-20 and Figure 6B, object 603) to specify a new value for the attribute (Viswanath, [0069], lines 4-5, specifically the set command)”.

21. With respect to Claims 11 and 22, the Claims are rejected for the same reasons as Claims 8 and 18 above.

In addition, Fuchs disclosed: “wherein the second window pane is to display a list of one or more operations of the monitor managed bean, if the operation tab is selected ([0093] to [0095], specifically [0095], where each MBean management interface comprises operations)”.

22. With respect to Claims 12 and 23, the Claims are rejected for the same reasons as Claims 8 and 18 above.

In addition, Kekic disclosed: “wherein the second pane is to display an invoke button to selectively invoke (Col. 55, lines 44-45, and Figure 6B, object 606, specifically button “Edit Value”)”;

and, Fuchs disclosed: “listed operations of the monitor managed bean ([0093] to [0095], specifically [0095], where each MBean management interface comprises operations)”.

23. With respect to Claim 32, the combination of Viswanath and Kekic disclose: “The article of manufacture of claim 30, wherein the electronically accessible medium provides further instructions that, when executed by the apparatus, cause the apparatus to display a second window pane having an attribute tab (Kekic, Col. 24, lines 12-13)”, and “and display a list of one or more attributes of the monitor managed bean

Art Unit: 2451

(Viswanath, [0021], lines 1-7), if the attribute tab is selected (Kekic, Col. 24, lines 12-13)".

The combination of Viswanath and Kekic do not disclose: "and an operation tab".

However, Fuchs disclosed: "and an operation tab ([0093] to [0095], specifically [0095], where each MBean management interface comprises operations)".

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the server administration system of Viswanath in view of Kekic with the teachings of Fuchs to include support for a interface having an operations tab. Motivation to combine these references comes from Kekic, "As a user looks at the visual display in the graphic user interface, the user is provided the same visual information as if the user where physically present at the location of the managed computer network element. Thus, at a glance, a user can obtain considerable information about the status of the computer network element as represented by the visual display (Abstract, lines 26-32)". Therefore by combining the server administration system of Viswanath in view of Kekic with the operations interface of Fuchs, a user can obtain operations information about a managed element at a glance.

Response to Arguments

24. Applicant's arguments filed 2 September 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues: “Kekic fails to disclose a system-level hierarchical relationship among monitored resources, and instead only shows a tree for local resources” (pg 11, lines 7-9). Examiner respectfully disagrees, Kekic shows a system-level hierarchical relationship among monitored resources, see for example Fig. 6A, 6B, object 305, and Col. 24, lines 28-41, where a user is checking different servers in the monitored and the system-level hierarchal monitor tree is displayed as object 305.

Furthermore, Viswanath disclosed a system-level hierarchical relationship among monitored resources: “there is a hierarchical relationship among the elements of the configuration data. In this embodiment, the elements and their hierarchical relationship are represented in the meta-information” ([0025], lines 15-18), where elements can be defined as: “The meta-information may describe elements to be administered and their attributes. For example, an element called "server" may have attributes such as name, locale(s), log-root, etc.” ([0064], lines 11-14). The elements may be a server, and in a cluster of application servers (see [0053], Lines 1-3) this means a system-level hierarchal relationship among monitored resources.

25. Applicant's arguments, see pg 11, line 24 – pg 12, line 3, with respect to claims 1-7, 13-17, 24-28 and 29-31 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Applicant argues Viswanath does not disclose: “a JMX monitoring system, with a cluster of application servers that spans multiple JVMs” (pg 11, lines 25-26). Examiner

Art Unit: 2451

respectfully disagrees, Viswanath disclosed: a JMX monitoring system ([0120], lines 1-3), with a cluster of application servers that spans multiple JVMs ([0030], lines 1-5).

Applicant further argues: “a cluster of application servers has multiple server instances and a central services instance, which Applicants do not understand to be shown [in] the cited references” (pg 11, lines 28-30). Examiner respectfully disagrees, Viswanath disclosed: a cluster of application servers has multiple server instances ([0053], lines 1-3) and a central services instance ([0094], lines 1-8).

26. Applicants arguments, see pg 12, lines 4-10, have been considered but are not persuasive. Applicant argues Viswanath and Kekic do not disclose the amended portion, and therefore Claims 8-12, 18-23 and 32 are allowable. Examiner respectfully disagrees, see rejections and arguments above.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MATTHEW S. LINDSEY whose telephone number is (571)270-3811. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thurs 7-5, Fridays 7-12.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on (571) 272-3964. The fax phone

Art Unit: 2451

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

MSL

11/05/2008

/John Follansbee/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2451